- 1			
1	WALKUP, MELODIA, KELLY & SCHOENBERGER  A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION		
$\begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 3 \end{bmatrix}$	650 California Street, 26 <sup>™</sup> Floor San Francisco, California 94108-2615		
4	T: (415) 981-7210 · F: (415) 391-6965  MICHAEL A. KELLY (State Bar #71460)		
5	mkelly@walkuplawoffice.com RICHARD H. SCHOENBERGER (State B	ar #122190)	
6	rschoenberger@walkuplawoffice.com MATTHEW D. DAVIS (State Bar #141986	,	
$\begin{bmatrix} 7 \\ 8 \end{bmatrix}$	mdavis@walkuplawoffice.com ASHCON MINOIEFAR (State Bar #34758 aminoiefar@walkuplawoffice.com	3)	
9	SHANIN SPECTER (Pennsylvania State I	Bar No. 40928)	
10	(Admitted Pro Hac Vice)   shanin.specter@klinespecter.com		
L1	ALEX VAN DYKE (CA State Bar No. 3403	379)	
$\lfloor 2  \Big $	KLINE & SPECTER, P.C. 1525 Locust Street Philadelphia, PA 19102		
13	Telephone: (215) 772-1000 Facsimile: (215) 772-1359		
4	ATTORNEYS FOR ALL PLAINTIFFS		
	TANAMAD COM LONG	Diampiam collect	
16			
L7   L8	JANE ROE, an individual; MARY ROE,	Case No. 4:24-cv-01562-AMO	
	an individual; SUSAN ROE, an individual; JOHN ROE, an individual;	PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR	
20	BARBARA ROE, an individual; PHOENIX HOTEL SF, LLC, a	ADMINISTRATIVE RELIEF TO CONSIDER WHETHER	
$_{21}$	California limited liability company; FUNKY FUN, LLC, a California limited	PLAINTIFFS' DECLARATIONS SHOULD BE FILED UNDER SEAL	
22	liability company; and 2930 EL CAMINO, LLC, a California limited	FILED CONCURRENTLY WITH	
23	liability company,  Plaintiffs,	PLAINTIFFS MOTION FOR ADMINISTRATIVE RELIEF REQUESTING PERMISSION TO USE	
24	v.	PSEUDONYM ON PUBLICLY FILED PLEADINGS	
25	CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN	ASSIGNED FOR ALL PURPOSES	
26	FRANCISCO, a California public entity,	TO THE HONORABLE ARACELI MARTINEZ-OLGUIN, COURTROOM	
27	Defendants.	10 Action Filed: 02/14/2024	
28		Action Filed: 03/14/2024	

Trial Date: Unassigned 1 PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that, pursuant to local Rule 7-11 and Local Rule 79-2 3 5, Plaintiffs file this Administrative Motion to Consider Whether Plaintiffs' Declarations Should be Filed under Seal. Pursuant to relief sought in Plaintiffs' 4 concurrently Administrative Motion to Request Permission to Use a Pseudonym on 5 Publicly Filed Pleadings, the materials sought to be sealed by this administrative 6 7 motion are the true names of five Plaintiffs. Plaintiffs seek an order permitting them 8 to use pseudonyms in any publicly filed documents, including the complaint. 9 A party seeking to file materials under seal bears the burden to show 10 materials are deserving of confidentiality. (Foltz v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co., 331 F.3d 1122, 1135 (9th Cir.2005).) Specifically, a party must "articulate compelling 11 12 reasons supported by specific factual findings that outweigh the general history of 13 access and the public policies favoring disclosure." (Kamakana v. City and County of Honolulu, 447 F.3d 1172, 1179 (9th Cir.2006) (internal citations omitted).) 14 15 Five of the Plaintiffs in this case concurrently seek an order permitting them to use pseudonyms for fear of retaliatory physical harm. (See Plaintiffs Motion for 16 Administrative Relief Requesting Permission to Use Pseudonym on Publicly Filed 17 Pleadings ("Administrative Motion to Use Pseudonym"), generally.) Federal courts 18 have allowed plaintiffs to use pseudonyms for various reasons, including when 19 "identification creates a risk of retaliatory physical or mental harm." (Does I thru 20 XXIII v. Advanced Textile Corp., 214 F.3d 1058, 1068 (9th Cir. 2000).) 21Plaintiffs seek injunctive relief from the City and County of San Francisco's 22 23 ("City") de facto treatment of the Tenderloin as San Francisco's "containment zone" 24 for illegal narcotics activities and the associated crimes and injurious harms. Public disclosure of their names could expose them to physical retaliation by those involved 25 26 in the illegal narcotics trade. Plaintiffs have a legitimate private interest, namely 27 their safety, in seeking to have their true names filed under seal.

In support of that motion, Plaintiffs submit declarations containing their true

28

names and describing the conditions that cause them to fear retaliatory physical harm. (Declaration of Jane Roe ("Jane Roe Dec."), ¶¶1-13; Declaration of Susan Roe ("Susan Roe Dec."), ¶¶1-7; Declaration of Mary Roe ("Mary Roe Dec."), ¶¶1-7; Declaration of John Roe ("John Roe Dec"), ¶¶1-7; Declaration of Barbara Roe ("Barbara Roe Dec."), ¶¶1-8.) Each plaintiff has expressed trepidation to move forward with their claims if her or his name is to be publicly revealed. (Jane Roe Dec., ¶¶12-13; John Roe Dec., ¶7; Mary Roe Dec., ¶7; Susan Roe Dec., ¶7; Barbara Roe Dec., ¶8.)

Defendant City and County of San Francisco has not agreed to stipulate to the use of pseudonyms and has instead opposed that approach. (See ECF no. 16 and accompanying declaration of Matthew D. Davis.) Thus, Plaintiffs must submit declarations in support of their request to use pseudonyms. (Civil Local Rule 7-11.) Plaintiffs have no less restrictive means to request relief to use pseudonyms, other than by submitting declarations that contain their true names. Redaction and sealing of their true names is the only sufficient means to seek the administrative relief related to their complaint.

Plaintiffs request that should this Court deny this administrative motion to seal Plaintiffs' declarations, then Plaintiffs be given the opportunity to withdraw the declarations that are being provisionally filed under seal. As is set forth in the declarations, some of the individual plaintiffs may decide not to remain involved in this litigation if the Court decides that their true names should be revealed in publicly filed documents. (Jane Roe Dec., ¶¶12-13; John Roe Dec., ¶7; Mary Roe Dec., ¶7; Susan Roe Dec., ¶7; Barbara Roe Dec., ¶8.)

The portions of the documents sought to be sealed are:

DOCUMENT	PORTIONS TO BE FILED UNDER SEAL
Exhibit A to the Declaration of Matthew D. Davis in Support of the Motion to File Under Seal,	Plaintiff Jane Roe's true name on pages 2 and 7.

1	Declaration of Jane Roe	
$_2$	Exhibit B to the	Plaintiff John Roe's true name on pages 2 and 5.
4	Declaration of Matthew D.	
3	Davis in Support of the	
$_4$	Motion to File Under Seal, Declaration of John Roe	
5	Exhibit C to the  Declaration of Matthew D.	Plaintiff Susan Roe's true name on pages 2 and 3.
6	Davis in Support of the Motion to File Under Seal,	
7	Declaration of Susan Roe	
8	Exhibit D to the Declaration of Matthew D.	Plaintiff Mary Roe's true name on pages 2 and 3.
9	Davis in Support of the Motion to File Under Seal,	
10	Declaration of Mary Roe	
11	Exhibit E to the   Declaration of Matthew D.	Plaintiff Barbara Roe's true name on pages 2 and 5.
12	Davis in Support of the	
13	Motion to File Under Seal, Declaration of Barbara Roe	
14		
15	Respectfully submitted.	
16	Dated: March 21, 2024	WALKUP, MELODIA, KELLY & SCHOENBERGER
17		
18		By: /S/ Matthew D. Davis
19		MICHAEL A. KELLY
20		RICHARD H. SCHOENBERGER MATTHEW D. DAVIS
21		ASHCON MINOIEFAR
22		Attorneys for ALL PLAINTIFFS
23		
24		
25		
26		
$_{27}$		
28		
		1

1 PROOF OF SERVICE 2Jane Roe, et al. v. City and County of San Francisco, et al. Case No. 4:24-cv-01562-AMO 3 At the time of service, I was over 18 years of age and not a party to this action. I am employed in the county where the mailing took place, My business address is 4 650 California Street, 26th Floor, City and County of San Francisco, CA 94108-2615. 5 On the date set forth below, I caused to be served true copies of the following 6 document(s) described as 7 PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR ADMINISTRATIVE RELIEF TO CONSIDER WHETHER PLAINTIFFS' DECLARATIONS SHOULD BE FILED UNDER 8 SEAL DECLARATION OF MATTHEW D. DAVIS IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR 9 ADMINISTRATIVE RELIEF TO CONSIDER WHETHER PLAINTIFFS' 10 DECLARATIONS SHOULD BE FILED UNDER SEAL [PROPOSED] ORDER FOR PLAINTIFFS MOTION FOR ADMINISTRATIVE 11 RELIEF TO CONSIDER WHETHER PLAINTIFFS' DECLARATIONS 12 SHOULD BE FILED UNDER SEAL 13 to: **Co-Counsel for Plaintiffs** Shanin Specter, Esq. 14 (Admitted Pro Hac Vice) 15 Alex Van Dyke, Esq. KLINE & SPECTER, P.C. Telephone: (215) 772-1000 1525 Locust Street shanin.specter@klinespecter.com 16 Philadelphia, PA 19102 alex.vandyke@klinespecter.com 17 escalantevleana@uclawsf.edu 18 David Chiu, Esq., City Attorney Counsel for City and County of 19 Yvonne R. Meré, Esq., Chief Deputy City San Francisco Attornev 20 Wayne Snodgrass, Esq., Deputy City Attorney Steeley: (415) 554-4655 Tara M. Steeley, Esq., Deputy City Attorney Lakritz: (145) 554-4628 Thomas S. Lakritz, Esq., Deputy City George: (415) 554-4223 Murphy: (415) 554-6762 Attorney 22 John H. George, Esq., Deputy City Attorney Facsimile: (415) 554-4699 Kaitlyn M. Murphy, Esq., Deputy City tara.steelev@sfcitvattv.org 23 tom.lakritz@sfcityatty.org Attorney Deputy City Attorneys john.george@sfcitvattv.org 24City Hall, Room 234 kaitlyn.murphy@sfcityatty.org 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place 25 San Francisco, CA 94102-4682 26 27 BY CM/ECF NOTICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING: I electronically filed the document(s) with the Clerk of the Court by using the CM/ECF system. Participants

28

Participants in the case who are not registered CM/ECF users will be served by mail or by other means permitted by the court rules. I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct and that I am employed in the office of a member of the bar of this Court at whose direction the service was made. Executed on March 21, 2024, at San Francisco, California. Kirsten Benzien